



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,345	01/30/2004	Gary Eugene Spilman	79979	6372
22242	7590	09/13/2006	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			YOON, TAE H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/768,345	SPLILMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tae H. Yoon	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 17-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 17-33 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,306,956. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the aqueous composition of said patent encompasses the instant ratio of resin solids to organic solvent as evidenced by teaching at col. 10, line 61 to col. 11, line 9 and examples and because The recited preamble, a primer which is a part of a multi-layer automotive paint coating, has little probative.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 17 and 31 recite "polyester salt", but claims 18 and 32 recite that -COOH groups may be neutralized ---. Thus, the polyester dose not have to be a salt form, and claims 19 and 31 are confusing and improperly broadens the scope of claims 17 and 31.

The recited "less than about 400 nm" is indefinite. It has to be either "about" or "less than". See Amgen, Ins. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., 18 USPQ 2d 1016 (fed. Cir. 1991).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewarchik et al (US 5,484,842).

Lewarchik et al teach an aqueous dispersion of polyesters having a hydroxyl value of 20-150, an acid value of 30-100 and a weight average molecular weight of 1000-20,000 in abstract. Note that said weight average molecular weight is usually higher than a number average molecular weight due to polymer's polydispersity ( $M_n/M_w \geq 1$ ). Overlapping values are anticipation. Said polyesters have pendent carboxylic acid functionality (col. 3, lines 3-6) and are dispersed in water as very fine particles (col. 1, lines 39-40). Example 1 teaches a method of making polyester particles and a few dilution steps in order to obtain a pigmented coating composition. Said polyester inherently have the instant number average molecular weight and particle size of less than 400 nm since Lewarchik et al teach that said polyester particles are dispersed in water as very fine particles. Said composition contains about 1.9 wt.% solvent, 0.44 wt.% surfactant and a ratio of resin solids to organic solvent being about 19.5. The example 1 shows an acid value of 51.3, but Lewarchik et al teach an acid value of 30-100. See *In re Mills*, 477 F2d 649, 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972); Reference must be considered for all that it discloses and must not be limited to its preferred embodiments or working examples

The recited preamble, a primer which is a part of a multi-layer automotive paint coating, has little probative, and the recited "the primer comprising" permits the presence of other components such as pigments. Also, the recited properties are inherent.

With respect to claims 21-24, an invention in a product-by-process is a product, not a process. See *In re Brown*, 459 F2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972) and *In re Thorpe*, 777 F2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Thus, the invention lacks novelty.

Claims 17-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewarchik et al (US 5,484,842) in view of Goldner et al (US 4,968,536) and NL 8304021 A.

The instant invention further recites a clear coating comprising at least two layers over Lewarchik et al who teach automobile sheet metal coating at col. 5, lines 31-32. However, a polyester automobile coating and clear coating thereon is well known in the art as taught by Goldner et al (col. 1, lines 8-15) and a polyester dispersion having very small particle size of 30-400 nm is also known as taught by NL (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to coat a clear coating on the top of the pigmented coating on sheet metal (of automobile, for example) in Lewarchik et al with teaching of Goldner et al since a polyester automobile coating and clear coating thereon is well known in the art. Lewarchik et al teach very fine particles and NL teaches very small particle size of 30-400 nm, and thus particles of Lewarchik et al would be smaller than 400 nm.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tae H Yoon  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

THY/September 10, 2006